

ture, fighting being the main duty of life, have caused ripples only which will quickly pass away¹; and it is fortunate that the German ambassador, Baron von Holleben as well as the United States minister, Andrew White, are animated with the desire to re-establish the *entente cordiale* between the two nations.

Mass-meetings of German citizens in this country have been held of late for the purpose of assuring the German government that the Germans of this country have not yet forgotten that they are Germans. We are sorry to say, however, that the leaders of this movement have made one grave mistake, viz., that of expressing their German-American patriotism by an unnecessary and uncalled-for show of hatred of England. While it is quite true that the Anglo-Saxon friendship should not be an alliance in a political sense, which would commit America to the policy of Great Britain, we should rejoice that a good understanding between Great Britain and America has been established, and should not unreasoningly denounce these sentiments as a mistake and a national blunder. The German-American mass-meetings would have served a better purpose if they had insisted on a triple alliance of the three Teutonic nations,—the Germans, the English, and the Americans. We must not forget that Germany is the home of all Anglo-Saxons, and we wish heartily that the Germans of Germany would remember their kinship with Great Britain and the United States. These three nations are kin in spirit and civilisation, as they are kin in blood, and it ought to be the diplomatic ideal of their governments to pursue a policy of good-will, and to establish among the people of Teutonic blood a sentiment of brotherly friendship.²

The United States is a cosmopolitan nation, and the ideal of our diplomacy must be to remain on good terms with all the nations of the world. Should the necessity come that we must go to war, let it be *for a cause but never against any nation*. At the present time it is our earnest desire to re-establish the good relations with Spain. Our right to regulate the conditions on the islands in American waters has been recognised, and the cause of all ill feeling against Spain has been removed. Further, we wish that unnecessary irritation and mutual spitefulness between our own and other nationalities, above all the Germans and the English, should cease on all sides, and that a policy of lasting good-will and international friendliness be recognised as the common ideal of the diplomacy of all nations.

P. C.

THE FILIPINO QUESTION.

It has been fashionable of late to hold mass-meetings in almost all large cities, either to support or vigorously to denounce the present administration on account of its expansion policy. We are not opposed to expansion, as was indicated in a former article on the subject, so long as expansion comes as a natural result of growth and through duties which historical events force upon us. We are opposed, however, to an expansion by the suppression of the rights of others; it would be an act of injustice on the part of the United States to pursue a policy either of conquest or of imperialism. Accordingly, there is no sense in denouncing the expan-

¹ The publication of a letter written by a German naval officer, and also the speech of the captain of the Raleigh, are on the same footing, and only prove that soldiers are not diplomats. The importance of such evidences of a military patriotism should not be exaggerated in diplomatic circles.

² Authors and newspaper writers on both sides of the Atlantic have sinned much. The worst I have seen is a most venomous article written by a German university professor; and a German diplomat used to say that the Yankees are anti-German, but that the German-Americans are even more so. He meant perhaps anti-imperialistic.

sion policy of the United States; there could arise a cause for censure only if we can prove that our administration pursues a policy of injustice toward other nations; but it seems to me that the situation is at present not yet sufficiently clear to allow of the formation of a final judgment.

The affairs in Cuba have undoubtedly been handled with great discretion, and seem to have reached a consummation which is much better than could be hoped for.

The case seems different in Luzon. Aguinaldo's forces are resisting the authority of our government with armed hand, and the probability suggests itself that either our administration or its representatives have committed some mistakes. Taking all in all, we must confess, however, that it is very difficult to say how these mistakes, if they were committed, might have been avoided, for it is certain that the policy of those who censure the administration most vigorously on the ground that we should have left the Filipinos to themselves could not have led to the insurance of a condition of peace and liberty in those islands, but would have served simply to complicate the situation.

Our war with Aguinaldo is lamentable, but it was probably unavoidable; for granting even that the representatives of our government committed mistakes in not respecting the pretensions of the revolutionary government of the Filipinos, we cannot exonerate Aguinaldo either; for his claims were exaggerated, and it would have been a grievous mistake on the part of the United States to recognise in him the legitimate representative of the Filipinos. Aguinaldo is not a Gomez, and whatever his ability may be as a dictator and general, he has not proved himself to be an organiser of a republic such as would insure the liberties of the European residents of Manila, as well as of the native Filipinos. His methods of government, so far as we can judge by probabilities and precedents, do not recommend themselves.

The present situation is a new departure and presents many new problems involving our executive government in unforeseen difficulties. Under similar conditions other nations have made mistakes, and as it is but human to err, we may expect that we shall not be found entirely faultless. We must therefore not lose patience if we hear reports of occurrences which indicate that now and then some of our representatives or citizens did not act up to the standard of our ideals.

In the face of the fact that Aguinaldo, with all those who have taken up arms against the United States, draw their main strength from the moral backing which they receive from the anti-expansionists of the United States, we deem it a patriotic duty not to join in the hue and cry of those who unreasoningly condemn our administration. Our administration could neither tolerate the presence of armed hordes in the new provinces, nor recognise the legality of a dictatorship upheld by military force. We cherish the confidence that our administration means to do what is right; that it will ultimately endeavor to establish home rule in all those territories which have been ceded to our government; that it will allow them the utmost range of liberty which the people of these districts can stand; and that if mistakes have been committed the grievances caused thereby will in time be duly redressed.

P. C.

HENRY CLARKE WARREN.

Henry Clarke Warren, a Pâli scholar of highest standing, the author of *Buddhism in Translations*, and a man of a rarely noble character, passed away in the beginning of the present year, and we have delayed the announcement of his death